

REMARKS

Applicant has studied the Office Action dated August 2, 2005. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 7, 10 and 13 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

It is submitted that the application, as amended originally filed is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 6 and 7 have been amended to address claim objections based on informalities or to more clearly disclose the invention. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments have support in the application as originally filed and are not related to patentability.

Objections to Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 6 and 7 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that that materials recited in claims 6 and 7 are not "inorganic materials" and fail to further limit the claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claim 1, upon which claims 6 and 7 depend, have deleted the recitation of "inorganic material" and, therefore, claims 6 and 7 now do further limit claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the ground for the objection has been overcome and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

§ 112 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the recitation of "inorganic material" that has a specific "elastic modulus" in the claims is not supported by the disclosure in the specification.

With this paper, independent claims 1 and 10 as well as dependent claim 13 have been amended to delete the word "inorganic." It is respectfully asserted that the ground for the rejection has been overcome and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-14 of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as originally filed, are requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: November 22, 2006

By: 

Richard C. Salfelder
Registration No. 51,127
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 035884